



Exploring Perceptions of Group Processes in Ice Hockey Officiating

Hancock, D. J., Martin, L. J., Evans, M. B., & Paradis, K. F. (2018). Exploring Perceptions of Group Processes in Ice Hockey Officiating. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 30(2), 222-240.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200.2017.1349208>

[Link to publication record in Ulster University Research Portal](#)

Published in:
Journal of Applied Sport Psychology

Publication Status:
Published (in print/issue): 03/04/2018

DOI:
[10.1080/10413200.2017.1349208](https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200.2017.1349208)

Document Version
Author Accepted version

General rights
Copyright for the publications made accessible via Ulster University's Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy
The Research Portal is Ulster University's institutional repository that provides access to Ulster's research outputs. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact pure-support@ulster.ac.uk.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

Exploring Perceptions of Group Processes in Ice Hockey Officiating

Submitted to: *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*

Submitted: December 1, 2016

Resubmitted: April 10, 2017

Main Body Word Count: 6976

Abstract

Understanding factors that influence sport officials' performance is vital to ensuring fair sport competition. Through semi-structured interviews ($N = 17$), we explored officials' perceptions of group processes that occurred among ice hockey officiating teams. Participant responses revealed numerous ways that group processes were present within officials' interactions, and two unique characteristics involved the transient nature of officiating groups (frequently performing with different officials) and intra-team competition pertaining to post-season assignments. In the discussion, we expand on the unique nature of officiating groups, synthesize activities in which officials seek to enhance groupness, and provide insights for future interventions and researchers.

Keywords: group dynamics, sport officials, intra-team competition, performance psychology

Exploring Perceptions of Group Processes in Ice Hockey Officiating

Peak athletic performance requires perceptual-cognitive skills (e.g., anticipation; Müller & Abernethy, 2012), social support (e.g., elite coaching; Bloom, Crumpton, & Anderson, 1999), and talent development (e.g., sampling sport; Côté, 1999). While less frequently studied, referees, assistant referees, umpires, and linesmen/lineswomen (collectively termed *officials* herein) represent central sport figures, and understanding their peak performance is equally important. Officials' tasks are complicated, as they attempt to make rapid, accurate decisions that influence competitive outcomes. Soccer officials, for instance, make up to 200 observable decisions per match (Helsen & Bultynck, 2004). Though officials have been researched to understand athletic performance, it is beneficial to study officials for the sake of optimizing officials' performances (Rix-Lièvre, Hancock, & Côté, 2014). The first step in such an endeavor is to identify criteria that facilitate successful performance, enabling officials to learn and apply those criteria. Mascarenhas, Collins, and Mortimer (2005) proposed five skills required for officials' success: (1) fitness/positioning; (2) knowledge/application of the law; (3) game management; (4) contextual judgment; and (5) psychological features. Certainly, these skills outline requisite criteria for peak individual performance. Overlooked by Mascarenhas and colleagues, however, are the complexities of teamwork. In ice hockey, up to four officials (i.e., two referees and two linesmen) work collectively during competition. Therein, officials possibly engage in interdependent actions where one official's performance influences, and is influenced by, in-game partners. Understanding the critical role of group dynamics in these interactions, therefore, is paramount to understanding officials' performance.

Group dynamics describes "the nature of groups, the laws of their development, and their interrelations with individuals, other groups, and larger institutions" (Cartwright & Zander, 1968,

p. 19). Individual and group factors influence how groups function, as do cognitions and behaviors of individuals in the group. One official rarely adjudicates a competition, and group processes are likely present. For example, officials make collective decisions, plan movements, and communicate—described as effective coordination (i.e., members act in complementary ways to succeed; Eccles & Tenenbaum, 2004). Interactions in and around competitions might represent group-based teamwork, including maintaining positive interactions among members, or preparing, executing, and evaluating group performances (McEwan & Beauchamp, 2014).

Social psychology theories might explain how group processes satisfy desires for group membership and influence individual experiences. Researchers suggest humans have an innate need for inclusion (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Brewer & Caporael, 2006), and although officials perform individual tasks, an innate need to belong is likely present and should be considered. Additionally, officials typically belong to larger organizations (e.g., officials' associations) that provide structure and guidance for members. Such organizations might constitute a core element of officials' social identities (e.g., Tajfel & Turner, 1985). Since group identity influences a range of outcomes from efficacy (e.g., Rubin & Hewstone, 1998) to adherence behaviors (e.g., Spears, Doosje, & Ellemers, 1999), understanding the specific groups to which officials identify is important. Whereas officials belong to larger organizations, competitions are officiated in smaller groups, highlighting that task-specific performance subgroups exist. Thus, the contexts of group membership are important considerations when investigating officials.

Applying the aforementioned group processes to enhance officials' interactions and performance depends on whether officials represent legitimate groups. This is significant, as not all collections of individuals conceptually and practically represent groups (Carron & Eys, 2012). Carron and Eys (2012) consolidated five characteristics that must be satisfied for group

classification: (1) members must see themselves as a group (*self-categorization*; Tajfel & Turner, 1985), (2) members likely influence one another (*common fate*; e.g., Fiedler, 1967), (3) the group's existence is rewarding to individual members (*mutual benefit*; e.g., Bass, 1960), (4) the group experiences emergent roles, norms, and leadership (*social structure*; Newcomb, 1951), and (5) members interact frequently (*quality interactions*; Shaw, 1981). Despite belonging to a larger organization, officials commonly perform with partners they have rarely, or never, met. This calls into question whether officials meet the five characteristics for group classification.

Considering whether a collection is a group—and by extension, experiences group processes—is conceptualized as entitativity (i.e., the degree to which a collection of individuals is an entity; Campbell, 1958). The degree of entitativity (also termed *groupness*) could result from the group's physical properties, or individual perceptions of group members (Hamilton, 2007). Recent findings indicate that athletes who perceive increased groupness also experience greater commitment, intentions to return, and identity perceptions (e.g., Martin, Balderson, Hawkins, Wilson, & Bruner, 2017; Spink, Ulvick, McLaren, Crozier, & Fesser, 2015).

Considering their unique nature, obtaining a clear understanding of how group processes apply to officials is critical, especially since group processes are more potent in true group environments, compared to mere affiliations (e.g., Estabrooks, Harden, Johnson, & Pardo, 2014). Therefore, it was important herein to investigate group processes among officials, exploring the extent to which officials believed group processes to be evident in their interactions. Such knowledge is imperative to optimizing group performance and officials' personal experiences, achieved through interventions, policies, or broader organizational practices.

Beyond exploring officials' group processes, the present study serves as a foundation for research oriented toward improving officials' performance, retention, and social experiences.

Group cohesion elevates athletic performance (Carron, Colman, Wheeler, & Stevens, 2002), and possibly, the same is true of officials. This is relevant, as officials' performances typically require teamwork to execute tasks. Secondly, officials' performance requires a complex skill set necessitating talent development, which is undermined by high attrition (VanYperen, 1998). Consequently, the officials' talent pool is prematurely minimized, leading to advancement based on necessity rather than competence (Auger, Fortier, Thibault, Magny, & Gravelle, 2010). Suggestions for reducing officials' attrition include enhancing positive affect (VanYperen, 1998) and facilitating social connections (Hancock, Dawson, & Auger, 2015), both of which are influenced by group processes. Thus, our purpose was to study the nature of group processes and group characteristics among ice hockey officials. Considering this research was initiated on an assumption that groups influence many aspects of officials' experiences (e.g., on-ice performance; social interactions) we specifically sought to: (1) explore the group processes revealed within these groups—including whether ice hockey officials met the five characteristics needed to constitute group members (Carron & Eys, 2012), and (2) study how group processes shape officials' personal experiences and performances. In doing so we believed we could identify whether officials constitute groups, making inferences for improving officials' performances.

Method

Qualitative orientation and methodology

The lead author is an experienced ice hockey official (he officiated in the Canadian Junior Hockey League), and his belief that group processes were relevant for officials prompted the research. We applied a realist ontology and post-positivist epistemology couched within a critical realist orientation (see Maxwell, 2012) that guided the current methodology. From a

1 realist stance, group concepts like status, performance, or cohesion are natural group processes
2 that emerge among officials and represent an underlying reality. We thus presumed that personal
3 experiences could be probed and interpreted using existing theories and research pertaining to
4 group dynamics in sport. By using critical realism we acknowledged the fallibility of claims of
5 generalizable laws and, instead, used theory as a way to describe individuals' unique experiences
6 in groups (e.g., referees vs. linesmen; newcomer vs. veteran) and to explain how these
7 experiences may be impacted by group structures.

8 In line with this orientation, we utilized a generic descriptive methodological approach
9 (i.e., Caelli, Ray, & Mill, 2003; Sandelowski, 2000) by adopting common tools from dominant
10 qualitative perspectives. Our descriptive methodology applied to data collection, sampling (e.g.,
11 purposeful sampling and semi-structured interviews: Patton, 2002; Polkinghorne, 2005) and
12 thematic analysis (Braun, Clarke, & Weate, 2016). We also adopted tools from more specific
13 methodologies (e.g., collaboration during analysis; Hill, Thompson, & Williams, 1997). Each
14 tool was employed as a piece in an overall methodology with the goal of describing officials'
15 experiences with groups.

16 **Participants**

17 We used purposive sampling, identifying participant criteria that enabled descriptive
18 interviews (Patton, 2002). We sought elite amateur ice hockey officials with at least two years'
19 experience in the Canadian Hockey League¹ or the Canadian Junior Hockey League². In these
20 leagues, officials perform in four-person teams, with two referees (i.e., responsible for awarding

¹ The Canadian Hockey League (athletes 16-20 years) is a national amateur ice hockey league, which includes a small percentage of international players. It is considered the most elite amateur ice hockey league in the world, producing 40-50% of the draftees for the National Hockey League (<http://www.nhl.com/ice/page.htm?id=31877#2>).

² The Canadian Junior Hockey League (athletes 15-20 years) is a national amateur ice hockey league, one tier below the Canadian Hockey League. Players often attain collegiate scholarships, with a small percentage being drafted to the National Hockey League. We recruited from one branch of this league, the Central Canada Hockey League.

goals and assessing penalties) and two linesmen (i.e., responsible for monitoring off-sides and icings). We sampled participants until saturation was reached (i.e., iteratively analyzing data to identify when few novel concepts were revealed), yielding 17 male officials ($M_{age} = 30.53$ years, $SD = 5.62$, range = 22-40; $M_{experience} = 13.0$ years, $SD = 7.17$). This represented 10 referees (coded R1 to R10) and seven linesmen (coded L1 to L7). Ten officials were employed in the Canadian Junior Hockey League; seven worked the Canadian Hockey League.

Procedure

We obtained institutional research ethics board approval before recruitment, and participants provided written consent prior to the interviews. The Referee-in-Chief for each league was contacted via email, wherein the authors explained the project purpose and data collection process. The Referee-in-Chiefs were asked to forward the email to all association members, asking interested officials to email the research team regarding participation.

Face-to-face semi-structured interviews were conducted by the first ($n = 14$) and second ($n = 3$) authors. Both interviewers engaged in online journaling after each interview, describing main themes discussed by the participants, as well as researchers' insights. Every three to five interviews, the interviewers spoke on the phone to share insights and reflections. The interviews were conducted in mutually convenient public spaces over two summer months (participants' off-season). Interviews averaged 40m51s (range: 30 to 50 minutes; transcribed verbatim totaling 122,386 words). Following initial analysis, officials were emailed their coded transcripts and a summary of results. We encouraged participants to provide feedback or to identify discrepancies between their intended meanings and our interpretations; however, no participants replied.

Interview Guide

Interviews were guided by open-ended questions (see Appendix A) and probing questions when necessary. Interviews began with initial questions to establish rapport (Patton, 2002) and develop a shared sense of each participant's pathway through officiating. We encouraged participants to describe the nature of their interactions with other officials, contrast their positive and negative experiences, and reflect on how the groups to which they belonged affected their experiences. Core questions included, "Can you discuss some of the things that might lead you to consider yourself to be part of a group or not?" and "Can you provide examples to demonstrate how feeling close to your fellow officials enhances or hinders your performance?" Actual interview processes shifted over time, and emerging concepts were probed in later interviews. For example, it emerged that group processes existed for on-ice performance (i.e., task-specific context), peer relationships (i.e., social context), and officials' organizations (i.e., organizational context). Interviewers probed each potential context.

Analysis and Validity

Interviewers completed post-interview reflective journals, which were shared with the research team through an online document. Entries detailed the core concepts participants discussed, researcher observations, and emerging concepts. The goal of journaling was to maintain sensitivity to the ways that the researchers' prior experiences and the research process shaped interviews (Mays & Pope, 2000). This helped challenge assumptions and allow all team members to take on the role of critical friends, while ensuring interviewers could use shared knowledge to advance toward later interviews (Bradbury-Jones, 2007; Hill et al., 1997). This process laid a foundation for thematic analysis, where the objective was to move beyond descriptions of group experiences and advance toward an understanding of officials' group dynamics both in and out of competitions (e.g., Braun et al., 2016; Patton, 2002). Phase one of

1 analysis was open coding, which was conducted by the third author. After reading transcripts
2 and interviewer journals, the third author reviewed the interviews on a line-by-line basis to
3 identify descriptive content (e.g., participants' experience) and analytical codes (e.g., feeling
4 powerless as new officials); emergent concepts were labelled using NVivo®. This process
5 revealed 82 unique open codes, primarily grouped by the third author into 18 categories.

6 Regarding the phase of developing, refining, and naming themes, the research team
7 independently reviewed the coded interviews before hosting a conference call to discuss how to
8 represent the data using core themes. During the conference call, it was noted that the majority
9 of officials' group experiences could be positioned rather effectively using Carron and Eys'
10 (2012) framework. In fact, 14 of the 18 categories could be collapsed within one of the five
11 defining characteristics of groups (Carron & Eys, 2012); four categories fell outside group
12 dynamics theory, and were retained within two themes that depicted the unique forms of
13 transience and competition that underpin officials' groups. The first author then returned to the
14 interviews and notes to interpret the data using this framework, identifying representative quotes
15 and experiences that supported descriptions of each theme. As Carron and Eys' (2012)
16 framework was applied to represent the data *after* initial coding, this thematic analysis was
17 neither inherently inductive nor deductive. Rather, it represents abductive reasoning (Ryba,
18 Haapanen, Mosek, & Ng, 2012) as it acknowledged participants' unique group experiences,
19 while recognizing an opportunity to frame some of those experiences using characteristics that
20 underpin what it means to be in a group.

21 For validity, it is important to recall our critical realist orientation where numerous forms
22 of validity are sought. Whereas internal generalizability to participants' experiences and
23 evaluative validity are considerations, the most central forms of validity outlined by Maxwell

(2012) include descriptive validity (i.e., accuracy of an account and the extent that it represents participants' experiences), interpretive validity (i.e., whether the description holds true to the experiences and perspectives of the participants) and theoretical validity (i.e., the extent that a given interpretation presents a legitimate explanation of a phenomenon). In this light, an understanding of officiating groups is gained when effectively describing and interpreting participants' experiences, and when forming legitimate explanations of key constructs and how they relate to one another.

Descriptive and interpretive validity were addressed by adopting reflexive processes that recognized the unique positions of varying participants, interviewers, and research team members. Notably, this project was conducted as a research team, where each member contributed to the design, interviewing, transcribing, analysis, and writing. Journaling provided opportunities for teamwork to influence the interview and analysis process, and allowed each member to challenge assumptions and advance interpretations of the interviews despite geography separating the authors. The first and second authors also entered the project with rich personal experiences in elite ice hockey (first author is an official; second author was a player) that informed the research—especially when interpreting sport-specific norms, rituals, and values. Regarding theoretical validity, we targeted participants' varied experiences by contrasting reflections of referees and linesmen, as well as veterans and relative newcomers, to explore how differences in status shaped experiences (e.g., comparison: Maxwell, 2012; constant comparison; Corbin & Strauss, 2010). Not only did this approach provide a detailed understanding of group interactions among ice hockey officials, it also allowed us to incorporate group dynamics theory in the latter stages of analysis, which enabled opportunities to better explain various features of officiating groups.

Whereas ‘criteria’ of methodological quality often fail to accomplish validity (see Burke, 2016; Sparkes & Smith, 2009; Tracy 2010), methodological coherence and meaningful contributions are two common criteria that should be considered in the current investigation. Although the current study adopted tools from several methodologies, the project was guided by a critical realist theoretical orientation and applied methodological tools that suited this orientation. Although some methodological tools are not essential to a realist ontology (i.e., journaling and varying the interview approach with time), they were selected to enhance interpretive validity within this novel context. Additionally, we sought a significant contribution with meaningful claims to officiating research. By seeking participants who belonged to similar contexts in a similar geographic region, we sought a rich depiction of experiences from distinct actors who were bound within a broader system of elite Canadian ice hockey. This did not represent a collective case study approach (see Hodge & Sharp, 2016), but it was an attempt to develop meaningful claims in the participants’ context. In other words, by drawing all participants from a single context we could learn norms and shared experiences in that context and build upon them to strengthen the link between our findings and applied practice.

Results

Officials discussed task-focused interactions among four officials collectively performing on-ice, as well as communication that took place before, during, and after games. Group interactions also extended outside of the arena through social activities, friendships, and mentorships that represented informal group settings. Lastly, participants noted that governing bodies facilitated group interactions. Collectively, officials described experiences across organizational, task-specific (i.e., on-ice performance), and social contexts—with each context representing unique group characteristics and considerations. Embedded in these contexts and

the group's impact on the individual, participants reflected on the nature of group-related processes they experienced. Using Carron and Eys' (2012) framework, data were primarily grouped into five themes representing central group characteristics. Two additional and unique themes were officials' transient nature and intra-team competition.

Characteristics that Constitute a Group

Self-categorization. As an essential characteristic for the classification of a group, all participants perceived themselves as group members. On one hand, officials consistently referred to the four individuals on the ice as a team, "We're a team on the ice—it's a team game...we're the ones working together, we're the ones coming together, and we're the ones that have to stick together [and] get each other's backs during the game." (R8) Alternatively, participants referred to their broader affiliations and identity as hockey officials, including descriptions of the larger officials association:

[We call ourselves] Team 21—we're the 21st team in the league, there are 20 actual hockey teams. We're a team out there whether you like the [other] guy or not. You have to respect him and you do have to be a team for that two and a half hours. For me, I think it's really important and the more I do this, the more committed I feel to that idea. (R7)

Officials stated that these shared identities ultimately facilitated group pride:

It's a pretty proud thing to go on the ice. Especially in the playoffs with a pretty packed arena knowing that you're the four that kind of control the atmosphere and the tone for the entire place. So it's a pretty proud feeling once you're out there, knowing that you've accomplished enough to get to this level. It's a select few that get to do what you do...you still get goose bumps when you get out on the ice. (L2)

1 When describing group experiences, officials categorized themselves within their
2 organization, and as on-ice groups. By categorizing themselves as belonging to these groups and
3 valuing their membership, participants reflected on resulting experiences of pride and identity.
4 The quotes exemplified that categorization was not only a personal experience, but a collective
5 one where participants tied feelings of commitment and cohesion to shared identities as officials.

6 **Common fate.** Across participants, it was apparent that when a significant event
7 occurred to one member, it influenced other officials. Influential events included specific on-ice
8 tasks, or more general group-related perceptions shared among members, such as cohesion and
9 conflict. For on-ice performance, all participants spoke of the degree to which their performance
10 was influenced by on-ice partners. One participant described shared penalty call responsibilities:

11 You don't want to be the guy calling 10 penalties and you don't want be the guy who
12 didn't call the 10 penalties. For the most part, in the four-man system, 50% of the calls
13 both your hands go up [to indicate a penalty]—at least. The other 50% is in your zone in
14 front of you. You get what I'm saying? [Penalty calls] should be fairly even. (L6)

15 Similarly, maintaining consistency in the application of rules was paramount: "You rely on your
16 referee partner to be consistent, just like you hope to have some consistency. So whether it is
17 [penalty calls] like holdings, trippings—things like that—you know you're on the same page."

18 (R9) Alternatively, when rule application was inconsistent, it could lead to conflict:

19 There's been some times, too, when you're right there and you see [the play]—you're
20 like, "No penalty". And your partner's hand shoots up [to indicate a penalty]. I
21 remember when [the four-man system] first came in, guys would lose their [expletive] in
22 the room on guys who called a penalty, but they go home and watch the tape and it's a
23 penalty. Most of the guys have learned that when your partner calls a penalty you say,

1 “Okay”, and most of the time you just want to find out why it was a penalty. You just
2 wanna get in his thought process. So you’re like, “On that play what did you see?” And
3 he’ll say, “Okay, well I saw it this way.” And you’re like, “Okay, fair enough.” (R5)

4 Beyond executing one’s duties, every participant discussed the group-related perceptions that
5 were contingent on interactions with fellow officials—notably, cohesion and conflict. Officials
6 highlighted the need to act cohesively, recounting the importance of having similar goals to their
7 officiating peers, and setting aside personal conflict for the group’s benefit. One official stated:

8 ...I had done a game with that guy and I put those feelings aside for the next 60 minutes
9 because there was a task at hand to accomplish. It’s never easy, it’s always in the back of
10 your mind, but you need to put it aside for the sake of the team. I’m still talking to him
11 because we still have a job to do. (L2)

12 Participants indicated that team members influenced their on-ice performances. As one
13 official reported, “If one guy screws up, it falls on the crew at the end of the game.” (R8) Thus,
14 common fate means that—despite positional differences, conflicts, and competition—the nature
15 of their activity demands cohesion and fosters actions to form a shared vision (e.g., asking why a
16 partner called a certain penalty). Such results also highlighted the importance of minimizing
17 harmful behaviors (e.g., interpersonal conflicts) that negatively influence on-ice performances.

18 **Mutual benefit.** In ideal cases, officials’ group experiences were rewarding—both by
19 sharing social support, and by satiating desires to belong and feel connected. In terms of
20 support, many officials expressed its necessity during stressful events, and how the predominant
21 source of support was other group members:

22 It’s important that referees feel part of the group, because they would use the group as a
23 support system. The guys that may not be confident or saw something that they’re not

1 sure, they just want to go to the guys and say, “Hey, did I make the right call there?” or,
2 “‘What did you see?’” And if that group setting wasn’t there, they wouldn’t be able to do
3 that—they’d just be sitting on the ice with a lot of thoughts to themselves. (R4)

4 Whereas support was typically provided during on-ice performances, belonging and
5 feeling connected to the group extended beyond that environment. One participant eloquently
6 described why these perceptions were so important for officials:

7 Nobody wants to be part of an association where they don’t feel welcome. And I think
8 the onus is on each member of the group as to the level of involvement they want to have
9 within the group. I mean, I don’t think it would be fun for somebody coming to work a
10 game together and feel they are an outsider, or on the outside looking in. (L4)

11 Sense of belonging was often fostered by social activities that allowed officials to feel connected
12 to the larger group, and these could be formal, (e.g., season-end banquet, referee vs. linesmen ice
13 hockey game) or informal in nature:

14 Even if it’s going to the [restaurant] down the street, splitting a pitcher of beer, and
15 talking about the game. Or the experience—guys you haven’t been on with a lot, maybe
16 just talking about how the season’s gone. Or if you haven’t seen them since last year,
17 how their summer was, how the family’s doing. It’s relaxing after the game just to kind
18 of catch up with the guys. (L2)

19 Among the mutual benefits of belonging to officiating teams, participants discussed on-
20 ice shared decisional support, while off the ice, participants described a sense of belonging and
21 feeling connected to team members. Thus, reciprocal interdependence was present, as officials
22 gained something from membership, yet needed to contribute something in return.

1 **Social structure.** Participants reflected on the social structure present among officials,
2 which was demonstrated by how members of on-ice groups and officials' organizations often fit
3 within certain forms of subgroups, occupied individual roles, and shared normative expectations.
4 Unmistakably, central fault lines divided officials into referees and linesmen, along with
5 divisions separating those who were older and had more seniority with relative newcomers:

6 There [are] groups that stick together. You have the old-boys club, you have the guys
7 that kinda grew up together refereeing that seem to be a lot closer, and then you have the
8 younger guys that tend to stick together as well. And, you know [this younger group]
9 could be a mix of referees and linesmen, or just linesmen. (R4)

10 These fault lines often distinguished those with more power in the organization. Accordingly,
11 this structure also underpinned the roles that group members fulfilled; for instance, "We don't
12 have an official crew chief, but I think it's unwritten that, 'Ok he's the more senior [referee], he's
13 kind of the crew chief.'" (R1). Traditions or norms also followed:

14 There is also cultural stuff...typically rookies will give away their first game fee. So a
15 rookie comes in and works his first game, but he isn't getting paid that night because the
16 other guys take their money. Or if you happen to be somewhere where you can go out
17 for dinner and drinks, the rookie buys those because that's his initiation...like,
18 "Congratulations! You made the league." (R10)

19 Social structure provided the most insight into group divisions based on position (i.e.,
20 referees vs. linesmen) and seniority (i.e., veterans vs. newcomers). Typically, referees had
21 greater social capital (e.g., power) than linesmen, as evidenced by their informal appointment as
22 crew chiefs, even when a linesman had seniority. Meanwhile, veterans (regardless of position)

1 typically prescribed group norms and traditions (e.g., mandating that rookie officials bought
2 post-game drinks). Social structure, therefore, influenced on- and off-ice group experiences.

3 **Quality interactions.** All participants noted that communication was vital, which was
4 categorized as quality interactions. Communication existed during competitions (i.e., task
5 communication) and outside of competitions (i.e., social communication). Participants noted
6 that, before each game, task communication was imperative to establish a shared understanding.
7 Specifically, officials shared their on-ice tendencies (e.g., positioning, penalty standard) and
8 knowledge of any players who would be participating in the game (e.g., players to keep an eye
9 on). Task communication continued during performances, as evidenced below:

10 [During games there is] lots of verbal [communication] with the linesmen; they'll speak
11 to each other out loud across the ice. There is also a lot of communication between
12 [referees] and linesmen because they cross paths a lot. So the linesman that is standing
13 on the blue line, on their way to the other end, the [referee] will always pass that
14 linesman on the way to get into position [and ask questions] like, "What did you see there
15 with the puck? Did it tip off the mesh? Did that high stick—was it actually high or was he
16 jerking my chain?" (R10)

17 Participants explained that communication existed away from the arena, through social
18 media or negative discussions about group members, which could have a detrimental impact:

19 Guys who speak negatively about other officials... if they're talking about those guys,
20 who's to say they're not talking about you when you're not around. You lose that sense
21 of community when you start to badmouth guys or put them down or talk about how this
22 guy did a bad job or this guy. (R2)

1 Quality interactions extended to mentorship, as many officials noted that senior officials
2 serve the role of mentor, aiding young officials' development through constant discussions of on-
3 ice performance. Lastly, officials articulated that relationships/friendships are important:

4 Most of my friends now are referee buddies...my close friends are all referee friends. I
5 golf with [a fellow official] quite regularly. There's other guys that I golf with quite
6 regularly, and then there's other guys that I'll just go for a drink with from time to time.
7 It's expanded my group of friends. There's guys that I never would have met that I've
8 met through refereeing. (R1)

9 As officials' on-ice tasks demand collective actions, participants believed they needed to
10 use communication to improve performance (i.e., task communication, mentorship). In fact,
11 officials achieved teamwork mainly through on-ice communication. Friendship provided further
12 evidence of quality interactions, as most officials described creating or strengthening friendships
13 with other officials. Thus, quality interactions existed in multiple contexts.

14 **Unique Elements Pertaining to Ice Hockey Officials**

15 **Transience.** Contrasting group definitions, a unique aspect of officials' groups was that
16 they were constantly changing. Participants recalled the challenges associated with the brief
17 amount of time they worked with other officials—often switching partners from one game to the
18 next:

19 The thing about 90 guys that you work with is, you're never working a lot with the same
20 guys, so you're always concerned—you're always thinking about doing the right thing
21 and making the right call—but you're also concerned about showing up at the rink on
22 time and doing all the little things that made you successful to get to that point.
23 Particularly when you're meeting new guys. (R7)

1 Further emphasizing the unique challenges of such transience, one senior official highlighted
2 how unlikely it would be for sport teams to adopt similar transient approaches, as doing so would
3 likely decrease team performance.

4 When considering the challenges of transience, officials suggested that trust is heightened
5 when working with familiar partners: “I think [familiarity] makes [performance] better because
6 there’s that trust. As a referee group, you kind of have to—I’m not going to say rely on each
7 other—but you have to respect their judgment and not overrule them.” (L3) Further, officials
8 enjoyed themselves more when working with friends: “When I get a game and I see the four
9 guys on the game and they’re all good buddies...I’m more excited to get to the game you know.
10 The car ride, jokes, the game, the beers afterwards.” (R8) Despite enjoying working with
11 familiar partners, officials noted that skill is prioritized over familiarity for important games:

12 I’d rather work with somebody I like. But if you’re working the [final game], that game
13 means the most, and as tough as it is, I’d rather pick my buddy to [officiate] a regular
14 season game. I definitely pick the guy that knows what they’re doing for the finals. (R3)

15 Altogether, participants believed their group’s transient nature was a salient construct,
16 unique to their profession, and worthy of consideration in relation to individual and team
17 performance. Participants even noted that their organizations set clear guidelines for members in
18 terms of pre-game communication to facilitate communication among unfamiliar officials (e.g.,
19 referees ought to establish areas of responsibility).

20 **Intra-team competition.** A second finding was the constant, underlying intra-team
21 competition. Indeed, in addition to working as a collective group during competitions, each
22 official is rated individually by the organization, and ratings influence important game

1 assignments (e.g., post-season games). Participants' discussions began with post-season
2 assignments as a measure of advancement and the competition to earn those positions:

3 Guys that are given a chance to go to the playoffs understand [it] is a great opportunity,
4 and they've worked hard—you earned it. You've elevated your game and you are one of
5 the best guys in the league. So there's respect that's gained and earned. (R6)

6 I'm out there to be the best, and I don't expect you to give me your [post-season] spot. If
7 I'm going to get your spot it's because I'm going to take it from you and I'm going to
8 earn it. If people have problems with that...they can kiss my [expletive]. (R8)

9 Participants also indicated the intricacies between individual goals for progression and
10 managing the on-ice product with their group members:

11 As a team, you want to have the best product on the ice that night. We take great pride in
12 what we do, so of course we all want to do the best job. But then, as individuals, you
13 want to do the best job too—so you want to be the best official on the ice. That's how we
14 get [to officiate in the] playoffs...and I think all referees are competitive that way. So it
15 makes you work hard because if you're working with another solid guy, you definitely
16 want to out-skate him or make sure you get all the penalties and stuff like that. (R5)

17 Finally, participants conceded intense competition could lead to negative emotions for
18 deselected officials:

19 It's tough. There's lots of mixed emotions that come from either if he makes it and I
20 don't make it. My supervisors all say I did very well—I don't know what his [supervisor
21 scores] are if I can't see them. But I know that I did this well on the dry land stuff and he
22 did very poorly. Or I know that I worked this many games and he's only worked this
23 many. So there's mixed emotions—people get mad and people get happy. (L6)

Although participants demonstrated collective orientations and strove to effectively officiate contests as a team, the desire to be selected for post-season competitions was an important consideration for group and individual performance.

Discussion

Our purpose herein was to investigate group processes among officials (including whether they could be considered groups), while also studying how they might shape officials' personal experiences and performance. For officials, group processes were prevalent across three contexts (task-specific, social, and organizational), and participants' responses articulated the necessary characteristics for group classification (Carron & Eys, 2012). Importantly, participant responses were derived from elite officials with years of experience, meaning they had access to rich personal histories. Generally, responses aligned with group dynamics research, though officials' transient nature and intra-team competition were unique themes. Considering that participants described various activities that enhanced group processes, we dedicate a section to highlighting and integrating these findings.

Group Processes in Officials' Groups

The results showcase the importance of group dynamics for officials, as Carron and Eys' (2012) group categories were all represented within participant responses. Notably, self-categorization occurred predominantly through group identity and shared pride, whereas common fate was evident through shared responsibility for penalty calls, as well as how cohesion and conflict influenced performance. For mutual benefit, the officials' group provided social support, leading to a sense of belonging. The social structure of officials' groups included divisions based on roles (referees vs. linesmen) and seniority (veterans vs. relative newcomers). Finally, officials indicated that quality interactions occurred through task-relevant and task-

1 irrelevant communication, as well as mentorship. These are several examples of the salience of
2 group processes identified in ice hockey officials' groups, reinforcing the need for further
3 research pertaining to additional processes that might influence officials' experiences at both the
4 individual and group levels.

5 At the individual level, enhancing group experiences might be a practical resolution to
6 address ongoing challenges with officials' attrition (e.g., Auger et al., 2010; Hancock et al.,
7 2015). Though officials' involvement was secondary to other duties (e.g., employment), group
8 experiences were motivating. It is worth considering the extent that social environments are rich
9 enough to satisfy officials' basic psychological needs for competence, autonomy, and relatedness
10 (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Presumably, positive group experiences reflect relatedness (e.g., 'Team
11 21'). Additionally, our study demonstrated how groups support officials' feelings that their
12 involvement is self-determined and autonomous (e.g., input into group decision making), along
13 with perceptions of competence (e.g., social support). Satisfying officials' basic psychological
14 needs through group processes could be an important avenue for officials' organizations to
15 explore, with the goal of establishing positive experiences and commitment.

16 Regarding group performance, Steiner (1972) suggested that group effectiveness is the
17 result of a group's potential productivity, subtracting process losses during performance. This
18 seems applicable to interactions with officials' groups, as participants frequently alluded to
19 process losses that impacted them, including poor communication, conflict, and lack of cohesion.
20 For instance, officials stressed challenges when their personal philosophy about play-calling and
21 communication conflicted with those of their on-ice partners. Considering cohesion and conflict
22 share an inverse relationship in sport teams (Paradis, Carron, & Martin, 2014), the reciprocal
23 cohesion-performance relationship (and by extension, the conflict-performance relationship;

Carron et al., 2002; Paradis et al., 2014) seems relevant for officials groups. We suggest officials' organizations investigate methods of enhancing communication and reducing conflict.

It was evident that group processes existed among officiating groups. Thus, it is important for future researchers to study officiating cohesion among the transient, on-ice teams, as well as the broader organization. This might provide an opportunity to extend our understanding of group cohesion, its application to different groups, and particularly how cohesion forms in groups that continually shift membership.

Uniqueness of Officials Groups

The unique transience of officials' groups—whereby an individual performs with many officials during the course of a season—might influence on-ice performance. To manage the demands of such transient groups, participants debriefed with their group before games to discuss personal tendencies and past experiences. These processes link to the preparation phase of teamwork (McEwan & Beauchamp, 2014), and exhibit planning activities vital for enhancing coordination (Eccles & Tenenbaum, 2004). Officials' reflections on the benefits of shared understanding, rule knowledge, and protocols for on-ice interactions can be explored using the concept of shared mental models (Mathieu, Heffner, Goodwin, Salas, & Cannon-Bowers, 2000). Essentially, shared mental models represent a common understanding or similar beliefs among a group, and such coherence pertaining to the competitive environment could position officials to best adapt during challenging situations and predict other group members' actions. Thus, two applied strategies for adapting to group transience are: (1) establish common pre-game debriefing and planning practices, and (2) strengthen shared mental models by establishing a common understanding of rules, philosophy, and protocol.

Intra-team competition involved intense rivalry for prestigious post-season assignments, which are predicated on subjective officials' rankings assigned by supervisors during the season. Whereas these statements align with positional competition in sport teams (Harenberg et al., 2016), unique features existed. First, officials stated intra-team competition was superseded by the need for interdependence, cooperation, and teamwork (e.g., Carron & Eys, 2012) to ensure successful on-ice performance. Secondly, only two referees and two linesmen are assigned to a post-season game, resulting in elevated intra-team competition. Finally, a stark contrast is that competing teammates can typically see each other perform (either in practice or competition), or their performances are objectively measured (e.g., timed sports), while the transient nature of officials' groups makes this a near impossibility. It is important for researchers to examine the influence of intra-team competition on group dynamics, performance, and transience, while also investigating methods to reduce intra-team competition. This could include understanding the consequences of intra-team competition (Stanne, Johnson, & Johnson, 1999) and the relationship between intra-team competition, cohesion, and conflict (Harenberg et al., 2016; Paradis et al., 2014). Practically, officials' organizations ought to consider how to make post-season selections that minimize intra-team competition, possibly improving officials' performances.

Officials Engage in Activities that Enhance Groupness

Officials engaged in implicit and explicit approaches to enhance groupness. First, officials cultivated group identity, which was best embodied by Team 21. In the Ontario Hockey League (a branch of the Canadian Hockey League), there are 20 teams. Officials and the organization created the concept of the 21st team, with shirts and helmet decals resembling this identity, increasing perceptions of cohesion (e.g., Carron & Spink, 1993; Paradis & Martin, 2012). Considering the overt intra-team competition, these efforts to maintain a cohesive

environment are important, and research supports the ability for cohesion to facilitate performance, satisfaction, adherence, and efficacy (Paradis & Martin, 2012). Second, formal and informal mentorship existed, and officials spoke to the resulting impact on performance and development, as well as the connection to the officials' group as a whole. Peer leaders provided mentoring functions including instrumental functions (e.g., task instruction, career assistance) and psychosocial functions (e.g., role modelling, friendship), leading to increased confidence and performance (Hoffmann, Loughhead, & Bloom, 2016). Lastly, officials described additional activities that enhanced groupness such as formal meetings, and shared travel/accommodations.

Opportunities exist, however, to implement theoretically-grounded group development and relationship building activities. Many of the activities officials described were unsystematic and not sustained—similar to team building in other organizations (Shuffler, DiazGranados, & Salas, 2011). Officials could build upon existing applied efforts to develop a shared identity (e.g., Team 21), which might involve integrating ways for officials to establish a unique identity each season, receiving input and acceptance from all members. Future researchers could investigate a team building protocol to be piloted and implemented across officials' groups, facilitating a direct team building approach. Finally, associations ought to explore formalized peer mentoring relationships by pairing senior and junior officials. Developing systematic, theory-driven interventions can increase organizational adherence and satisfaction (Hoffmann & Loughhead, 2016), which might affect officials' confidence, performance, and development.

Limitations

Limitations of this research include generalizability and social desirability. Ice hockey officials frequently interact with each other and players (i.e., interactors; MacMahon & Plessner, 2008), but not all sport officials operate similarly. For instance, gymnastics judges (i.e.,

monitors; MacMahon & Plessner, 2008) and soccer assistant referees (i.e., reactors; MacMahon & Plessner, 2008) have fewer interactions with athletes and other officials. Thus, we caution against generalizing our results to other sport officials—especially non-interactors. A second consideration is social desirability. During recruitment, we informed potential participants of the nature of the study, which was to examine group processes in ice hockey officials. As such, participants with negative group experiences might have declined to participate and readers should consider this.

Conclusion and Applied Recommendations for Officials and Organizations

Officials perceived themselves as group members (on- and off-ice), possessing unique elements (i.e., transience and intra-team competition), and engaging in activities that enhanced groupness. Importantly, several themes have practical considerations, and we have advanced five applied recommendations to guide officials and their organizations.

1. Institute team building activities to improve on-ice performance and reduce attrition.
2. Establish mentorships to pair referees with linesmen, and veterans with newcomers.
3. Create transparent policies to inform post-season assignments.
4. Minimize transience by creating smaller officials' groups that frequently work together.
5. Mandate standardized pre-game discussions that facilitate communication among *all* officials, with the aim of enhancing on-ice cohesion, while reducing on-ice conflict.

The above recommendations provide guidelines for officials' organizations, who ought to consider methods that facilitate group processes, thereby improving performance. The depth of our results highlights the need for continued research in this field to understand the impact of group processes on performance, retention, satisfaction, and well-being.

References

- Auger, D., Fortier, J., Thibault, A., Magny, D., & Gravelle, F. (2010). Characteristics and motivations of sports officials in the province of Québec. *International Journal of Sport Management, Recreation, & Tourism*, 5, 29-50. doi: 10.5199/ijsmart-1791-874X-5b
- Bass, B. M. (1960). *Leadership, psychology, and organizational behavior*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 497-529. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497
- Bloom, G. A., Crumpton, R., & Anderson, J. E. (1999). A systematic observation study of the teaching behaviors of an expert basketball coach. *The Sport Psychologist*, 13, 157-170. doi: 10.1123/tsp.13.2.157
- Bradbury-Jones, C. (2007). Enhancing rigour in qualitative health research: Exploring subjectivity through Peshkin's I's. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 59, 290-298. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04306.x
- Braun, V., Clarke, V., & Weate, P. (2016). Using thematic analysis in sport and exercise research. In B. Smith, & A. Sparkes, (Eds.), *International handbook of qualitative research in sport and exercise* (pp. 191-205). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Brewer, M. B., & Caporael, L. (2006). An evolutionary perspective on social identity: Revisiting groups. In M. Schaller, J. Simpson, & D. Kenrick (Eds.), *Evolution and social psychology* (pp. 143-161). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Burke, S. (2016). Rethinking 'validity' and 'trustworthiness' in qualitative inquiry: How might we judge the quality of qualitative research in sport and exercise science? In B. Smith, &

- 1 A. Sparkes, (Eds.), *International handbook of qualitative research in sport and exercise*
2 (pp. 330-340). New York, NY: Routledge.
- 3 Caelli, K., Ray, L., & Mill, J. (2003). 'Clear as mud': Toward greater clarity in generic
4 qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 2, 1-13.
- 5 Campbell, D. T. (1958). Common fate, similarity, and other indices of the status of aggregates of
6 persons as social entities. *Behavioral Science*, 3, 14-25. doi: 10.1002/bs.3830030103
- 7 Carron, A. V., Colman, M. M., Wheeler, J., & Stevens, D. (2002). Cohesion and performance in
8 sport: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 24, 168-188.
9 doi: 10.1123/jsep.24.2.168
- 10 Carron, A. V., & Eys, M. A. (2012). *Group dynamics in sport* (4th ed.). Morgantown, WV:
11 Fitness Information Technology.
- 12 Carron, A. V., & Spink, K. S. (1993). Team building in an exercise setting. *The Sport*
13 *Psychologist*, 7, 8-18. doi: 10.1123/tsp.7.1.8
- 14 Cartwright, D., & Zander, A. (1968). *Group dynamics: Research and theory*. New York, NY:
15 Harper & Row.
- 16 Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2010). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for*
17 *developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 18 Côté, J. (1999). The influence of the family in the development of talent in sport. *The Sport*
19 *Psychologist*, 13, 395-417. doi: 10.1123/tsp.13.4.395
- 20 Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and
21 the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 227-268. Doi:
22 10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01
- 23 Eccles, D. W., & Tenenbaum, G. (2004). Why an expert team is more than a team of experts: A

1 social-cognitive conceptualization of team coordination and communication in sport.

2 *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 26, 542-560. doi: 10.1123/jsep.26.4.542

3 Estabrooks, P. A., Harden, S. M., Johnson, S. B., & Pardo, K. A. (2014). Group integration

4 interventions in exercise: Theory, practice, and future directions. In M. R. Beauchamp &

5 M. A. Eys (Eds.), *Group dynamics in exercise and sport psychology* (2nd ed.; pp. 164-

6 182). New York, NY: Routledge.

7 Fielder, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

8 Hamilton, D. L. (2007). Understanding the complexities of group perception: Broadening the

9 domain. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 1076-1094. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.436

10 Hancock, D. J., Dawson, D. J., & Auger, D. (2015). Why ref? Understanding sport officials'

11 motivations to begin, continue, and quit. *Movement & Sport Sciences – Science &*

12 *Motricité*, 87, 31-39. doi: 10.1051/sm/2014018

13 Harenberg, S., Riemer, H. A., Karreman, E., Dorsch, K., Paradis, K. F., & Martin, L. J. (2016).

14 All for one, but not one for all? Positional competition and cohesion in interdependent

15 sport teams. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 38, S201.

16 Helsen, W. F., & Bultynck, J-P. (2004). Physical and perceptual-cognitive demands of top-class

17 refereeing in association football. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 22, 179-189.

18 doi: 10.1080/02640410310001641502

19 Hill, C. E., Thompson, B. J., & Williams, E. N. (1997). A guide to conducting consensual

20 qualitative research. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 25, 517-572.

21 doi: 10.1177/0011000097254001

- 1 Hodge, K., & Sharp, L. (2016). Case studies. In B. Smith, & A. Sparkes, (Eds.), *International*
2 *handbook of qualitative research in sport and exercise* (pp. 62-74). New York, NY:
3 Routledge.
- 4 Hoffmann, M. D., & Loughhead, T. M. (2016). A comparison of well-peer mentored and non-peer
5 mentored athletes' perceptions of performance and satisfaction. *Journal of Sports*
6 *Sciences*, 34, 450-458. doi: 10.1080/02640414.2015.1057517
- 7 Hoffmann, M. D., Loughhead, T. M., & Bloom, G. A. (2016). Examining the experiences of peer
8 mentored athletes competing in elite sport. *The Sport Psychologist*. Advance online
9 publication. doi.org/10.1123/tsp.2016-0052
- 10 MacMahon, C., & Plessner, H. (2008). The sport official in research and practice. In D. Farrow,
11 J. Baker, & C. MacMahon (Eds.), *Developing sport expertise: Lessons from theory and*
12 *practice* (172-190). New York, NY: Routledge.
- 13 Martin, L. J., Balderson, D., Hawkins, M., Wilson, K., & Bruner, M. W. (2017). Groupness and
14 leadership perceptions in relation to social identity in youth sport. *Journal of Applied*
15 *Sport Psychology*. doi: 10.1080/10413200.2016.1238414
- 16 Mascarenhas, D. R. D., Collins, D., & Mortimer, P. (2005). Elite refereeing performance:
17 Developing a model for sport science support. *The Sport Psychologist*, 19, 364-379.
18 doi: 10.1123/tsp.19.4.364
- 19 Mathieu, J. E., Heffner, T. S., Goodwin, G. F., Salas, E., & Cannon-Bowers, J. A. (2000). The
20 influence of shared mental models on team process and performance. *Journal of Applied*
21 *Psychology*, 85, 273-283. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.85.2.273
- 22 Maxwell, J. A. (2012). *A realist approach for qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- 1 Mays, N., & Pope, C. (2000). Assessing quality in qualitative research. *British Medical*
2 *Journal*, 320, 50-52. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.320.7226.50>
- 3 McEwan, D., & Beauchamp, M. R. (2014). Teamwork in sport: A theoretical and integrative
4 review. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 7, 229-250.
5 doi: 10.1080/1750984X.2014.932423
- 6 Müller, S., & Abernethy, B. (2012). Expert anticipatory skill in striking sports: A review and a
7 model. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 83, 175-187.
8 doi: 10.1080/02701367.2012.10599848
- 9 Newcomb, T. M. (1951). Social psychology theory. In J. H. Rohrer & M. Sherif (Eds.), *Social*
10 *psychology at the crossroads*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- 11 Paradis, K. F., Carron, A. V., & Martin, L. J. (2014). Development and validation of an
12 inventory to assess conflict in sport teams: The Group Conflict Questionnaire. *Journal of*
13 *Sports Sciences*, 32, 1966-1978. doi: 10.1080/02640414.2014.970220
- 14 Paradis, K. F., & Martin, L. J. (2012). Team building in sport: Linking theory and research to
15 practical application. *Journal of Sport Psychology in Action*, 3, 159-170.
16 doi: 10.1080/21520704.2011.653047
- 17 Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. London, UK: Sage.
- 18 Polkinghorne, D. E. (2005). Language and meaning: Data collection in qualitative
19 research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52, 137-145.
20 doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.137
- 21 Rix-Lièvre, G., Hancock, D. J., & Côté, J. (2014, September). *A lack of interconnectivity for*
22 *research on sport officials*. Paper presented at the First International Conference for the
23 Science and Practice of Sports Refereeing, Clermont-Ferrand, France.

- 1 Rubin, M., & Hewstone, M. (1998). Social identity theory's self-esteem hypothesis: A review
2 and some suggestions for clarification. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2, 40-
3 62. doi: 10.1207/s15327957pspr0201_3
- 4 Ryba, T. V., Haapanen, S., Mosek, S., & Ng, K. (2012). Towards a conceptual understanding of
5 acute cultural adaptation: A preliminary examination of ACA in female
6 swimming. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 4, 80-97. doi:
7 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2011.653498>
- 8 Sandelowski, M. (2000). Focus on research methods: Whatever happened to qualitative
9 description? *Research in Nursing and Health*, 23, 334-340.
10 doi: 10.1002/1098-240X(200008)23:4<334::AID-NUR9>3.0.CO;2-G
- 11 Shaw, M. E. (1981). *Group dynamics: The psychology of small group behavior* (3rd ed.).
12 New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- 13 Shuffler, M. L., DiazGranados, D., & Salas, E. (2011). There's a science for that: Team
14 development interventions in organizations. *Current Directions in Psychological*
15 *Science*, 20, 365-372. doi: 10.1177/0963721411422054
- 16 Spears, R., Doosje, B., & Ellemers, N. (1999). *Commitment and the context of social perception*.
17 Oxford, UK: Blackwell Science.
- 18 Spink, K. S., Ulvick, J. D., McLaren, C. D. Crozier, A. J., & Fesser, K. (2015). Effects of
19 groupness, cohesion, and intention to return in sport. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance*
20 *Psychology*, 14, 293-302. doi: 10.1037/spy0000043
- 21 Stanne, M. B., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1999). Does competition enhance or inhibit
22 motor performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 133-154.
23 doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.125.1.133

1 Sparkes, A. C., & Smith, B. (2009). Judging the quality of qualitative inquiry: Criteriology and
2 relativism in action. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 10, 491-497.

3 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2009.02.006>

4 Steiner, I. D. (1972). *Group processes and group productivity*. New York, NY Academic.

5 Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1985). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S.

6 Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2nd ed., pp. 7-24).

7 Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.

8 Tesch, R. (1990). *Qualitative research: Analysis types and software tools*. New York, NY:

9 Falmer.

10 Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight “big-tent” criteria for excellent qualitative

11 research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16, 837-851. doi: 10.1177/ 1077800410383121

12 VanYperen, N. W. (1998). Predicting stay/leave behavior among volleyball referees. *The Sport*

13 *Psychologist*, 12, 427-439. doi: 10.1123/tsp.12.4.427

14

Appendix A: Interview Guide**Initial Questions**

1. I am interested in hearing about your refereeing involvement - what have you been doing recently as a referee?
2. As a referee, you work alongside other officials. Can you describe the extent that this job is individual, or relies on interactions with other referees?
 - i. In what ways do you interact with other referees?
 - ii. When do you interact with other referees?

Opinion/Value Questions

1. As a referee, can you discuss some of the things that might lead you to consider yourself to be part of a group or not?
 - i. What aspects of your relationships with other referees make you a group, as opposed to a collection of individuals?
 - ii. What characteristics make it a group?
 - a. Communication
 - b. Cohesion
 - c. Roles
 - d. Norms/traditions
 - e. Shared common goals
2. Now that we have discussed your experiences working with other referees in groups, could you describe the most influential group you've been involved with as a referee, if you can think of one?
 - i. What was it that made this group so influential?
3. You described a group that had a fairly positive/negative influence on your experience. Alternatively, can you describe an experience where a referee group had a negative/positive influence on your experience?
 - i. What was it that made this group so positively/negatively influential?
4. As a referee, you are often placed into a new working group for each game. Can you tell me about the challenges, if any, of this environment?
 - i. What would be some strategies that you could use to limit these challenges?
 - ii. Are there any organizational protocols or strategies in place to facilitate these situations?
5. Do you spend time with your fellow referees outside the sport setting?

Feeling Questions

1. In your own words, how would you describe what it means to be in a 'group' with other referees?
 - i. Common fate
 - ii. Mutual benefit
 - iii. Social structure
 - iv. Interaction
 - v. Self-categorization
2. Can you provide examples to demonstrate how feeling close to your fellow officials enhances or hinders your performance?
 - i. How does this happen?
3. Is it important for referees to feel like they are part of a group? Why or why not?

Summary Questions

1. If you had any advice for referee organizations about promoting positive referee groups, what would you suggest?
 - i. Do you think team building exercises would be beneficial?
2. Is there anything that you think we missed and should discuss with regard to groups? Do you have any comments or questions before we conclude the interview?